SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

11th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XI, No. 1 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | January 15, 1981

Final Tally Shows Congress Was Good to R&D

Budget-cutting fever in the 96th Congress did not cripple scientific research as doomsayers predicted it would. Even the most pessimistic reading of the final figures for 1981 shows that total support for research and development grew by nearly 12 per cent over last year. Moreover, despite fears that Congress would not be nearly as appreciative of science as the Carter White House, the $37.4-billion R&D budget for the current fiscal year was only about 0.5 per cent less than the figure originally proposed by the Carter Administration.

The primary drop from the Administration's budget was sustained by the Department of Defense, as the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) points out in its newly issued annual review of Congressional action on the R&D budget. Other large research agencies—including the Department of Energy, the National Institutes of Health, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Department of Agriculture— received net increases over the President's recommendations.

So impressive were the gains in many agencies that Frank Press, Carter's Science Adviser, concluded that the Democratic White House had gotten "almost everything" it had wanted, and sometimes more than it had hoped for.

While university scientists and their Washington lobbyists are now breathing easier, rumors are already being whispered about that the Reagan Administration, like its Republican predecessors, may undo all the good work the Democrats so generously left behind. Some sources report, for example, that there is talk in the incoming Administration of proposing cuts to the 1981 figures when the fiscal 1982 budget is presented to Congress during the coming weeks. Even if those cuts do not materialize, Congress left the new Office of Management and Budget with the authority to make across-the-board cuts in several areas. For instance, the budgets of NSF, NASA, and EPA are subject to reductions of 3 per cent.

In a recent report, NSF credited much of the rising support for research to a strong push, which began in 1974, to solve the nation's health and energy problems. President Carter's desire to provide substantial support for basic research also helped revive university research, the report said.

For the whole decade, support for research grew by more than 9 per cent, NSF estimated in the study, titled *Federal Funds for Research and Development, Fiscal Years 1978, 1979, and 1980.*

Not only was there an increase in overall funds, there was also a shift throughout the decade away from defense spending, the report noted.

Even though defense spending dropped below the Administration's request, the overall defense R&D

(Continued on page 2)

Carter's R&D Appointees: Where Are They Going?

In Brief

That was quite a rhetorical smokescreen that NSF Director John Slaughter poured out at the AAAS Toronto meeting last week on the sensitive question of whether he plans to crimp basic research in behalf of more support for politically trendy engineering research. Said Slaughter, in discussing NSF's newly created Directorate of Engineering: "I want to emphasize that the nature of this new configuration reflects a shift in the way we plan to allocate resources rather than specific immediate decisions on dollar amounts or proposed allocations of those resources."

The Disease of the Month Club struck again in the closing days of the last Congress. What used to be the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases has been rechristened. Now it's the National Institute of Arthritis, Diabetes, and Digestive and Kidney Diseases. Goodbye, Metabolism. You lack public appeal.

Still no word on who's to be Reagan's science adviser—or even if he'll have one on board at the White House. GE research executive Arthur Bueche has been working nearly fulltime at Reagan transition headquarters, sort of as science adviser to the incoming crew. But Bueche, in a display of discipline virtually unprecedented in recent Washington history, firmly abides by the Reagan rule that transitioners must not discuss inside matters with the press.

Which leaves the possibility that Bueche might become Reagan's science adviser. No word on that, nor on reports that he's in line to be Director of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, in Austria.

How Basic Research Fared in FY81

(Budget authority in millions)

	President's FY 1981 Budget	Action by Congress: Approved	Action by Congress: Change	Percent Change: From Budget	Percent Change: From FY 1980
Health and Human Services	$1,804	$1,840	$+36	+2.0%	+ 6.7%
National Institutes of Health	(1,669)	(1,716)	(+47)	(+2.8%)	(+ 7.0%)
Other HHS	(135)	(124)	(-11)	(-8.3%)	(+ 2.5%)
National Science Foundation	902	902[1]	—	—	+10.8%
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	429	443[1]	+14	+3.3%	- 2.4%
Energy	586	573	-13	- 2.2%	+ 9.8%
Defense	518	503[2]	-15	- 2.9%	+14.6%
Agriculture	312	304	- 8	- 2.6%	+ 9.3%
Commerce	33	32	- 1	- 3.0%	+10.3%
Education	22	20	- 2	- 9.1%	—
All Other	273	273	—	—	+18.7%
TOTAL, Basic Research above	$4,879	$4,890	$+11	+0.2%	+ 8.4%

[1]Subject to application of general reduction (up to 3%).
[2]Subject to application of general reduction in amounts budgeted for inflation.
Source: AAAS

APPROPRIATIONS

(Continued from page 1)

budget jumped 16 per cent, bringing the total to $16 billion. Basic research in the department is expected to run about $575 million, 15 per cent above last year's figure. It is not yet clear just how much of the defense budget will go to university research, since the bulk of the funds are already earmarked for such big-ticket projects as the Trident II missile, a new strategic bomber, the MX missile, and the space shuttle.

NIH also fared well for 1981, although the increases over the Administration requests were not as dramatic as they have been in recent years. Overall, the institutes will receive $3.7 billion—8 per cent over 1980 and 6 per cent above the Carter request. Like dozens of other federal agencies, NIH's life was at stake in the final hours of the 96th Congress. Until the close of the session, when a continuing resolution was finally approved by both chambers, lawmakers continued to haggle over amendments to a continuing appropriations resolution that would provide funds for agencies for which no appropriations bills had been passed.

As finally approved by Congress and the White House, the resolution also extends support for programs that had been fully financed in fiscal 1980 but had not been authorized for fiscal 1981. Those programs include the National Health Service Corps, nursing research, health professions student assistance, assistance to community mental health clinics, and arthritis and diabetes programs.

NSF's research budget showed an impressive gain of 9 per cent, rising to just over $1 billion, under another appropriations bill passed by the 96th Congress. Support for science education, however, is only about 7.5 per cent of that total—the lowest ratio in 30 years. That trend is "hard to understand," said William D. Carey, Executive Officer of AAAS, considering the fact that our friendly allies in Europe and our not-so-friendly counterparts in the Soviet Union have begun to pay such close attention to science education in recent years.

(Continued on page 3)

. . .Space Agency, EPA Also Got Boosts

(Continued from page 2)

Education programs sponsored by the Department of Agriculture emerged stronger than ever from the last Congress. Under the agriculture appropriations bill signed last month by President Carter, agriculture research is set to rise 10 per cent, to $620 million, 3 per cent higher than the Administration requested. Some $200 million will go to cooperative research in land-grant colleges and state agriculture experiment stations. Cooperative research grants were set to get $16 million, and special research grants $17 million. Approximately $19 million will also go to various black colleges and Tuskegee Institute to upgrade their agriculture research programs.

Other agencies, while receiving less impressive gains in their research budgets, also are scheduled to get increases in federal support for the current fiscal year. NASA's R&D budget is expected to rise 7 per cent, to $4.4 billion; EPA's budget is also expected to climb 7 per cent, to $254 million; and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's budget is to climb 5 per cent, to $759 million.

Only one major program, an independent Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation (ISTC), failed to get the Congressional support it needed. The decision came as no surprise to those advocates of increased research in the developing world, which the institute was to have supported. Although there has been some support for new development programs in recent years, they will not be under a separate agency as supporters had hoped.

However, further Congressional action on foreign-assistance programs, which are now being financed through a continuing resolution, may provide additional support above the $12 million now alloted to scientific and technological cooperation, but most supporters agree that dramatic increases are unlikely.

With so few cuts in the federal R&D budget, why do scientists and educators continue to predict doom and gloom for U.S. research? The reasons have been spelled out often enough. Scientists argue, for example, that the costs of university research are rising far faster than their budgets or the general rate of inflation suggest. Increasing government red tape is also cited as a major obstacle in attracting and keeping talented researchers in government-supported projects.

In an effort to answer some of these complaints the 96th Congress passed measures that would require federal agencies to reduce their paperwork requirements and to refrain from writing regulations that would place unfair burdens on colleges and universities. Congress also passed a popular new patent bill that will allow universities to retain title—and thus profit from—inventions that emerge from federally sponsored research projects.

Although there has been plenty of talk about new administrative approaches to research, so far there have been precious few proposals put into action.—AR

USGS Appoints Research Chief

Robert L. Wesson has been appointed Assistant Director for Research, US Geological Survey, succeeding James R. Balsley, whom he replaced on an acting basis when Balsley retired in 1979.

NSF-China in Seismic Project

The National Science Foundation has provided $350,000 for a Sino-American earthquake-research project that will involve installation of some 35 ground-motion measuring instruments in the Beijing-Tianjing region of North China.

The project is being conducted by researchers from Caltech, the US Geological Survey, and the University of Southern California in collaboration with China's State Seismological Bureau.

J.C. Mark to Head NRC Advisor Unit

J. Carson Mark, who retired in 1973, after a long career at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, has been elected 1981 Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Paul Sherman, Chairman of the Metallurgical Engineering Department, Ohio State University, has been elected Vice Chairman.

©Science & Government Report, Inc., 1981

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Contributing Correspondents
Anne Roark, Clive Cookson (Washington); Michael Kenward (London); Francois Seguier (Paris)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report,* Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, June & July. Annual Subscription: Institutions, $118.50 (two years, $198.50); individuals, $48.50 (two years, $82.50). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

Exodus: Carter's R&D Aides Start Leaving

Following is what SGR has been advised of the post-inaugural status of some of the Carter Administration's high-level sci-tech appointees:

•

Frank Press resigned December 31 from his dual posts of Presidential Science Adviser and Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to return to MIT, where at his request, he's teaching a freshman geology class. But Press, who formerly chaired MIT's Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, is expected to return to Washington to assume the Presidency of the National Academy of Sciences next July 1, when Philip Handler, age 63, steps down from 12 years in the job. (Handler's associates say he's returning to Duke University, where he was chairman of the Medical School Biochemistry Department before succumbing to a virulent case of Potomac Fever.) Press is silent about his summer plans, since the election returns aren't in yet. But as the only candidate on the ballot, his election is reminiscent of the old vaudeville routine: "Sorry about your fire." Reply: "Sh, it's not till tomorrow."

With 20 days remaining to the Carter Administration at the time of Press' departure, the directorship of OSTP was assigned, on an acting basis, to his senior lieutenant, Associate Director Philip M. Smith, who's been involved with White House science affairs ever since Guy Stever served as adviser to President Gerald Ford. Smith says he hasn't decided yet what to do, but since he and Frank Press get on well, and few in Washington know the official science-policy community as well as Smith does, it would not be astonishing if he received a very senior appointive post at the Academy.

The Academy is the immediate destination of another oldtimer on the Washington scene, Spurgeon M. Keeny Jr., Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency since 1977. He's been appointed a scholar in residence at the Academy, and will be attached to the recently formed NAS committee on International Security and Arms Control. Keeny served with the White House Office of Science and Technology (predecessor of OSTP) from 1958 to 1969, and from 1973 to 1977 was Director of Policy and Program Development for the MITRE Corporation.

Another alumnus of the White House science office, Gilbert S. Omenn—currently an Associate Director at the Office of Management and Budget—says he hasn't yet decided whether he'll return to the University of Washington, where he's on leave until June from a professorship of medicine and medical genetics. In the meantime, he'll be a visiting professor for the spring semester at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton.

F. James Rutherford, who last year was appointed Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement at the new and, apparently, ill-fated Department of Education, is moving to the American Association for the Advancement of Science as "adviser on science education to the Board of Directors," says an AAAS announcement. Rutherford, formerly Assistant Director for Science Education at the National Science Foundation, is supposed to spearhead a new AAAS Board commitment "to a full measure of effort to reverse the damaging decline of science and engineering education in the United States."

At the Department of Commerce, Jordan Baruch is planning to follow the familiar Washington consultancy route when he steps down as Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology. Baruch, who came to government from dual professorships of business administration and engineering at Dartmouth, has rented an office in downtown Washington, and, solo, at least for the present, plans to consult.

Two officials who say they plan to stay on unless asked to leave are Jere E. Goyan, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, and D. Mark Hegsted, head of the Department of Agriculture's Human Nutrition Center. Since Hegsted, who went into emeri-

(Continued on page 5)

In Print

Occupational Mobility of Scientists and Engineers (NSF 80-317), 19 pages, a study by NSF, says these professionals move around a lot; of all S&E's in 1972, one in four was in a new job by 1978, and most shifts were to non-S&E jobs. Also, *Science and Engineering Personnel: A National Overview* (NSF 80-316), 48 pages, an integration and analysis of many of NSF's manpower reports. Single copies of both publications available without charge from: Division of Science Resources Studies, National Science Foundation, 1800 G St., Nw., Washington, DC 20550.

World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers 1969-1978, latest in annual series published by the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; reports worldwide military spending, by 145 countries, totals about $500 billion a year, and provides depressing, country-by-country comparisons for spending on weapons, health, and education; (166 pages, available without charge from: ACDA, US Department of State, Room 4734, Washington, DC 20451.)

80s Agenda: Restudy R&D Spending Patterns

The President's Commission for a National Agenda for the Eighties stirred a major inter-regional row recently when a leaked version of its forthcoming report revealed recommendations for Washington accepting and assisting the economic rise of the Sun Belt. While the Commission's views on science, technology, and economic growth are far less provocative, they nevertheless reflect influential thinking that's at odds with current policy. SGR, therefore, provides the following excerpts from the report, which is soon to be published.

●

Although increased support for science and technology will be important in the 1980's, better use can be made of government funds that are available for research and development. Particularly since World War II, the federal government has recognized that basic scientific research underpins essential scientific and technological progress and thus has assumed a special responsibility for its support. The link between scientific research and technological innovation is as subtle and imperceptible as it is undeniable. The thousands of scientists working in our nation's laboratories and the thousands of engineers, technicians, and inventors at work in American industry are linked by a bridge that must be kept in excellent repair if we are to continue to meet the challenges of growth. It is thus vital to maintain at least some minimal federal support across all fields of science. Beyond such core support, funds may well be targeted at particular areas of research opportunity or important areas of national need (e.g., energy).

Improved mechanisms for allocating resources for research and development will also be needed. In this regard, most of the questions of who should best fund research and development (e.g., the federal government or private industry) or who should best perform them (e.g., universities, industry, government laboratories) are too detailed to address here. However, two questions are paramount. The first is whether the opportunities and challenges the United States now faces, and which require investments in research and the development of technology, call for more or less government activity or direct government control. There are three ways that the federal government can encourage technological development that result in different degrees of government control. In order of increasing control, the first way is for the government to provide incentives or remove disincentives for private sector investment, which basically leaves decisionmaking to individuals in the private sector. The second way is for the federal government to provide funding in broad categories, while leaving specific project decisions to scientists, engineers, and others in the private sector. The government thus has some small amount of control over the decisionmaking process. The third way, and the direction in which the government has moved over time, is for the government to provide both funding and specific direction for re-

(Continued on page 6)

Members of the 80s Commission panel on Science, Technology, and Economic Growth are:

Glenn Watts (Chairman), President, Communication Workers of America

Charles Bishop, President, University of Houston

J. Fred Bucy, President, Texas Instruments

Edmund Pellegrino, President, Catholic University

Lewis Thomas, Chancellor, Memorial-Sloan Kettering Cancer Center

JOB SHIFT

(Continued from page 4)

tus status at Harvard last July, is the first head of the recently created Center, there's no transitional pattern for the post, but the way the Reaganites are talking—though they haven't mentioned the nutrition job specifically—they want as much of a clean sweep as possible.

As for FDA, its jurisdiction includes so many politically sensitive matters that it's considered highly unlikely that the new Administration would accept a holdover.

At the State Department, Thomas Pickering, the Assistant Secretary for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (OES), says he will submit a pro forma resignation from that post. Pickering is a career Foreign Service Officer and, therefore, will remain with the Department, but whether he'll be retained in the OES job is unknown.

Among the victims streaming down from the Election Day debacle on Capitol Hill, several have made connections while others are still looking around. Mike McCormack, the Washington State Democrat who was sometimes referred to as "Mr. Energy" because of his role on the House Science and Technology Committee, hopes to land a job in the Reagan Department of Energy; failing that, he'll look to industry, with which he is familiar through his committee work.

—DSG

. . ."Hard Choice" on Centers of Excellence

(Continued from page 5)

search and development projects. Increasingly these projects, such as research and development on synthetic fuels, are not for government's use, as would be the case, for example, with new tanks or missiles, but rather have potential commercial value.

There is a continuing debate regarding which of these methods of encouraging research and development is most effective, most appropriate, or most likely to be in the national interest. With the federal level of funds for research and development declining at the same time as the tendency for government to target those funds is increasing, there is concern the major decisions on which technologies to pursue may be overly concentrated in the public sector. Decentralized decisionmaking, which has traditionally characterized the shared responsibilities of the public and private sectors in the United States, has ensured a diverse and flexible system of research and development. Reliance on the private sector to make adequate investments and to select technological options that are viewed as acceptable by the public also has to be weighed against the demand that the government do whatever it can to solve perceived problems. The public may want to exercise its choices more through the market than through the political process, or vice versa.

The second question has to do with the trade-offs in support of science, in particular between support for individual research projects and a more centralized system of research support. When the federal government began to consider major patronage of basic scientific research in the universities after World War II, a deliberate decision was made in favor of support for individual projects. Although the costs of some types of research such as high-energy physics have always been sufficiently high to require more centralized facilities and funding mechanisms, in general there seemed to be enough money to spread around the universities across the country.

Now we face a hard choice between continuing this practice and moving more toward a system of research "centers of excellence" such as are found in the Federal Republic of Germany and other countries. The incentives for individual excellence and a diverse marketplace of ideas, inherent in the competitive, individual project system, will have to be weighed against the importance of keeping down the cost of doing research in the United States. The relationship between the research function of universities and the teaching function is also linked to this decision, as is the necessity for maintaining a diverse pool of researchers in universities. A further question that will arise involves the wisdom of using research and development funds in an attempt to provide some amount of assistance to financially strapped universities.

The trade-offs involved in both these issues—determining the extent to which the government should provide incentives for private sector research and development, as opposed to providing direct support, and the degree to which a "centers of excellence" approach to the support of basic research should be adopted—are difficult. Members of the Commission do not feel compelled to resolve them here, but believe that they will be among the most important issues faced in the development of policies for science and technology in the 1980s.

Britain's Royal Society Holds Presidential "Election"

London. Britain's Royal Society has just put on another of its rubberstamp presidential "elections"—employing, according to ancient tradition of "the Royal," electoral procedures that would warm the ideological heart of any eastern bloc apparatchik.

The choice of a new PRS (President of the. . ., as it's knowingly referred to) is actually carried out by a small band of officers of the Society—themselves a self-perpetuating group taken from the most establishment figures in the country's scientific community. And they abide by a set of conventions that go back over many years.

To begin with, it is an unwritten rule at the Royal that the Presidency has to alternate between the life sciences and the physical sciences. The Royal's officers always say that they will not be bound by this tradition when they go into the election process, but somehow they always go along with it. The person picked to be PRS also invariably has a Nobel prize and has won a couple of the Society's own medals. And the successful candidate will have spent some time as an active member of the Council of the Royal.

With these attributes all but essential, it isn't surprising that the Council comes up with a very short short list when it starts to sound out the opinion of the people who matter. There are some 900 Fellows of the Royal Society, themselves picked by other Fellows, but the first that many of them know of the new President is when they read his name in the newspapers.

There is a half-hearted attempt to sound out those important members of the scientific establishment who might be upset if the wrong man is made PRS, but when it comes to "election" day, the ballot is well and truly loaded. The election takes place at the anniversary meeting of the Royal, and the Fellows are pre-

(Continued on page 7)

Novice in Corridors of Power

(Continued from page 6)

sented with a single candidate. They can then either like it or lump it. And while many will privately express discontent—and that includes some of the people who are sounded out by the Council—none is willing to come out openly and express discontent at the choice.

This is certainly the case with the new President of the Royal Society, Professor Sir Andrew Huxley—yet another member of that famous family. Huxley isn't exactly a choice that arouses strong opposition among Fellows, but he wasn't exactly a popular choice; but then again, few of them could suggest more suitable candidates.

Huxley's election is not unpopular for any scientific reason—his credentials are exemplary. He won the Nobel Prize for Physiology or Medicine in 1963—sharing it with Sir Alan Hodgkin and Sir John Eccles for research on the physicochemical phenomena that underlie excitation and conduction in nerve fibres. And Huxley is currently Royal Society Research Professor in the Department of Physiology at University College, London.

The apprehension at Huxley's election springs mostly from his political inexperience; his recent experience in the corridors of power is, to put it mildly, sketchy. He admits to being somewhat out of touch with things, which is hardly a recommendation for one of the most politically important jobs in Britain's scientific establishment. We can expect none of the provocative pronouncements that Huxley's predecessor, Lord Todd, made during his five year term as PRS.

Quite how undemocratic the Royal's election process can be is illustrated by two small events. I first heard Huxley's name mentioned as the likely PRS last March. (And that confidence was imparted within the walls of the Atheneum, the establishment club that sits but a stone's throw from the Royal's headquarters.) And so democratic was the election that within hours after the vote was in the Royal Society managed to have professionally printed newsletters detailing Huxley's scientific credentials for distribution to the press. —MK

NIH Lab Chief Goes to Harvard

Philip Leder, Chief of the Laboratory of Molecular Genetics at the National Institute of Child Health and Development, has been appointed Chairman of the newly established Department of Genetics at Harvard Medical School. Leder, who will also be the first John Emory Andrus Professor of Genetics at the School, received his MD there is 1960 and spent most of his career at the National Institutes of Health.

Congressional Notes: Election Brings Shifts to Committees

Senator Edward Kennedy's principal forum for medical and research issues, the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research, has been wiped out by the new Republican majority on the parent Labor and Human Resources Committee. The Subcommittee's jurisdiction, which included authorizing authority for the National Science Foundation, will be taken over by the full committee, chaired by Orrin G. Hatch (R-Utah). Kennedy will be the top Democratic on the Committee.

Key figures to watch on science-related matters: Rep. Henry Waxman (D-Calif.), chairman of the Health and the Environment Subcommittee, which has authorizing jurisdiction over virtually all health-related federal programs—and most of them expire this year. Rep. George Brown Jr. (D-Calif.), chairman of the Science, Research, and Technology Subcommittee, which has wideranging jurisdiction. Brown and his staff are planning an active year of hearings on a big bundle of subjects, including information policy, international scientific relations, and a review of the basic legislation of the Bureau of Standards.

Meanwhile, Senator Harrison Schmitt (R-NM), has been raised to prominence by the Republican capture of the Senate. He's chairing the Commerce Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space and the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor and Health and Human Services.

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed

☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, $118.50 ☐; two years, $198.50 ☐

Individual subscribers: (To home address, payment by personal check)
one year, $48.50 ☐; two years, $82.50 ☐

(Overseas airmail, $25.00 per year additional.)

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Carter Science Chief Pens a Selective Tale

It's only January, but *Science* magazine has probably nailed down the Puff Job of the Year Award by giving Frank Press a rare 15 pages, spread over the issues of January 9 and 16, for a selective celebration of his tour as Jimmy Carter's science adviser.

Under Press' name, but reading like a committee-written company brochure, the articles aim for all the credit they can squeeze for Press and Carter as benefactors of the American scientific enterprise. Reasonable and informed people in Washington science-policy circles will, in fact, credit them with well-intended efforts, and some success, in the management of the government's research-related activities. But anyone accepting those articles as an accurate rendition of White House science affairs over the past four years probably has an affinity for fairy tales. A few specifics:

• Press writes: "President Carter, at the outset of his Administration, recognized the pervasiveness of scientific and technological concerns and the need for direct support in these areas. For this reason, he followed the tradition of several of his predecessors, choosing to have a science and technology adviser as part of his staff." The fact is, however, that Carter initially considered abolishing the science advisory post, which he regarded as so unimportant in the scheme of things that it was vacant for the first two and a half months of his Administration.

• Press writes, almost reverentially, of the enormously time consuming Domestic Policy Review that the Administration conducted on industrial innovation, and then amazingly concludes, "Perhaps the most significant result of the innovation review was to sensitize policymakers at all levels of government to the effect of their actions on industry's ability to innovate." The consensus around Washington is that the innovation exercise produced virtually nothing of value. Reagan's Science and Technology Task Force, composed mainly of industrial scientists and engineers, concluded that the few feeble efforts that did ensue are close to useless and should be terminated.

• It was a solo initiative by Joseph Califano Jr., the eventually ousted Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, that produced the great Health Research Principles planning operation at the National Institutes of Health. Aides in Press' office said they knew little about it, and typically, one disparagingly wrote it off as "Joe's show." Press tactfully writes that "OSTP has joined with Congress, NIH, the biomedical research community and the OMB to develop a consistent approach to NIH budget growth."

Omitted from this paean of self praise are any references to the collapse of the civilian space program, the persistence of maddening research agency red tape despite innumerable promises of federal reform, the growing hostility that key members of Congress felt toward Carter's management of science and technology, and the Administration's failure to do anything but amiably tag along on key technological initiatives, such as the Congressionally mandated boost for fusion development.

Around Washington, Press is properly credited with capably performing within the limited area of responsibility assigned to him by Carter and his political henchmen. And Press cannot be blamed for responding to an opportunity to use the widely read pages of *Science* to provide a favorable account of his service to Carter.

The real question is why *Science* allowed Press to report Press, and didn't assign the task to its overflowing news department.

Makes you wonder what's next— books reviewed by their own authors?—DSG

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

9999

Xerox-University Microfilms
300 N. Zeeb Rd
Ann Arbor MI 48106